

REMARKS

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claims 2-20, 24, and 25 have been canceled. Claims 22, 23, and 26, and amended claims 1, 21, and 27-29 are in the application.

The drawings were objected to because boxes shown in Figs. 1-4 have not been all labeled. Figs. 1, 2, and 4 have been amended herein so as to add labels to boxes illustrated therein. There are no boxes in Fig. 2. Figs. 1, 2, and 4 are attached at the end of this amendment as "Replacement Sheets." Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In explaining this objection, apparently due to the term "active antenna" in claim 1, the Examiner stated that proper antecedent basis for the term "active antenna" must be provided in the specification. Claim 1 has been amended herein to change the term "active antenna device" to "antenna device."

Claims 1, 21-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skarda et al.

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

“wherein when said received signal processing circuit and said user information processing circuit receive the state signal

indicating that said main unit is in the standby state and receive said detection signal indicating the absence of said storage medium in said slot while said sub-unit is in an operating state, said received signal processing circuit and said user information processing circuit are set into a non-operating state, and

wherein when said received signal processing circuit and said user information processing circuit receive said detection signal indicating the presence of said storage medium in said slot while said sub-unit is in a non-operating state, **said user information processing circuit is set into an operating state and said received signal processing circuit is maintained in a non-operating state.**” (Emphasis added).

It is respectfully submitted that Skarda as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter, merely “Skarda”) does not specifically disclose the above features of claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Skarda.

Claims 21-23 and 26-29 depend from claim 1 and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Skarda for at least the reasons previously described.


In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith
to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800